

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/855,945

Applicant(s)

ALFERNES ET AL.

Examiner

Urmi Chattopadhyay

Art Unit

3738

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Urmi Chattopadhyay.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Richard O. Gray, Jr..

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 February 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: None.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 3.

Identification of prior art discussed: Solem et al. (USPN 6,210,432).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of Solem et al., while not specifically disclosing the mitral valve annulus device as being configured to be slidably received on the guide wire, still being readable on a broadly interpreted claim 1 because the mitral valve annulus device mounted on the stabilizing instrument is riding on the guiding wire, whether the guiding wire passes through the stabilizing instrument or the device. Also discussion of Solem et al. being silent to the limitation of claim 3, that the mitral valve annulus device has a guide wire engaging structure at at least one of its opposed ends. Limitations of claim 3 should be included into claim 1 to overcome Solem et al. reference.